

### REMARKS

The Office Action of May 1, 2007 has been received and carefully reviewed. It is submitted that, by this Amendment, all bases of rejection are traversed and overcome. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 4-11, 14-23, 25-31, 33-38, 40-42 and 44 remain in the application. Claims 1, 11, 21, 29, 37 and 41 have been amended. Basis for these amendments are found in the specification specifically from page 6, line 25 to page 7, line 2 and on page 10, from line 6 to lin 9, and throughout the specification. Claims 2, 3, 12 and 13 are canceled herein. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-12, 14, 15, 17-2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Leon (U.S. Patent No. 6,701,304). With regard to claims 1 and 11, the Examiner states that Leon discloses a method for postage label authentication comprising receiving the mail piece; scanning the postage evidence for visible marks and non-visible marks to read visible mark information indicated by the visible marks and non-visible mark information indicated by the non-visible marks; and processing the visible mark information and the non-visible marks information to generate postage information for the mail piece. With regard to claims 2 and 12, the Examiner states that Leon further discloses the scanning of the non-visible marks using an Ultra Violet (UV) light. With regard to claims 4 and 14, the Examiner states that Leon further discloses processing the non-visible mark information to validate the postage evidence. With regard to claims 5 and 15, the Examiner states that Leon further discloses that the non-visible mark information comprises a key to the visible mark information. With regards to claims 7 and 17, the Examiner states that Leon further discloses that the visible marks and the non-visible marks comprise a bar code. With regard to claims 8 and 18, the Examiner states that Leon further discloses that the visible marks and the non-visible marks comprise Information Based Indicia (IBI). With regard to claims 9 and 19, the Examiner states that Leon further discloses that the postage information includes a postage amount. With regard to claims 10 and 20, the Examiner states that Leon further discloses that the

postage information includes data, an origination address, a destination address and security information.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Applicant's claim 1 is directed to a processing system that processes information obtained from visible and non-visible marks to generate postage information and a mail system including a handling system configured to scan non-visible marks using Ultra Violet (UV) or Infrared (IR) light with the non-visible marks being also detectable by human eye using a UV light. Applicant's claim 11 is a method for processing postage evidence including processing the visible and non-visible mark information to generate postage information and scanning the postage evidence for visible marks and non-visible marks to read visible mark information indicated by the visible marks and non-visible mark information indicated by the non-visible marks with the non-visible marks being also detectable by human eye using a UV light.

The systems disclosed in Leon are directed to i) a secure metering device which generates postage indicia, directs printing of the indicia, and performs accounting functions, and ii) an authentication system for the detection of the existence and contents of printed materials (e.g., to detect fraudulent indicia). However, the systems disclosed in Leon do not indicate any system wherein information included in a non-visible portion of the postage indicia is used as a key to decode the information in the visible portion of the postage indicia. Furthermore, as stated in the previous amendment, Leon does not teach or suggest using the retrieved information to generate postage information. Furthermore, Leon does not teach or suggest that the authentication system processes non-visible information by scanning the non-visible information with a combination of one or the other of UV and IR scanning as is presently claimed.

For the reasons stated above, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as defined in independent claims 1 and 11, and those claims depending ultimately therefrom, are not anticipated, taught or rendered obvious by Leon, either alone or in

combination, and patentably defines over the art of record. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102(e) rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 6, 13, 16, 21-23, 25-31, and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon. Claims 3, 6, 13 and 16 depend ultimately from one of claims 1 and 11. The Applicant reiterates those arguments pertaining to the rejections of claims 1 and 11 and submits that claims 3, 6, 13 and 16 are patentable over Leon for the same reasons. Independent claims 21, 29, 37 and 41 have been amended similarly to claims 1 and 11 to include a phrase about the non-visible marks being scanned or scannable by either UV or IR light. All the other claims in this rejection including claims 22, 23, 25-28, 30, 31, 33-36 are dependent on one of those independent claims. Thus, all of these claims now include the limitation that the non-visible marks be scanned or scannable by either UV or IR light.

The Examiner states that it would have been obvious from Leon for one skilled in the art to modify the method of Leon and include scanning the invisible ink using light of specified wavelength(s). Applicant disagrees with this statement because scanning the non-visible marks with a combination of both UV and IR produces advantages which are not suggested at all in Leon. A UV scannable mark is easily seen by the human eye with the help of black light. An IR scannable mark is under normal circumstances undetectable by the human eye. Thus when both types of marks are present in a non-visible mark, it is possible to quickly validate with black light that such marks are present by detecting the information in the UV scannable marks. However, in order to obtain all the information in the postage indicia, it is necessary to read not only the information in the non-visible scannable marks but also in the visible scannable marks. The information in either the non-visible or the visible scannable marks cannot be specifically detected and interpreted except by machine scanning both the non-visible and the visible marks together. Thus the information needs to be obtained from both the non-visible and the visible scannable marks by separate scanning means. By providing the non-visible marks to have a UV scannable portion to indicate easily under black light the presence of non-visible

marks, together with the IR scannable portion, which can only be read by a specific wavelength of machine, the present invention increases ease of use for those who use the system legitimately but adds another layer of difficulty for those, such as counterfeiters who would attempt to misuse the system, thus adding a layer of security not offered by a single wavelength of light scanning the same mark.

Claims 37-38, 40-42 and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon in view of Berson, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,039,257). With regard to independent claims 37 and 41 and the claims depending from them, the same arguments apply as are made above in the §103(a) rejection based on Leon alone. Berson teaches nothing that would lead one skilled in the art to use both UV and IR scannable portions together in the same system. Therefore the combination of Leon and Berson does not render obvious the presently claimed invention.

In light of the above arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103(a) rejections be withdrawn.

In summary, claims 1, 4-11, 14-23, 25-31, 33-38, 40-42, and 44 remain in the application. Although Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner's rejections herein, Applicant presents this amendment in order to expedite prosecution. It is submitted that, through this Amendment, Applicant's invention as set forth in these claims is in a condition suitable for allowance.

Further and favorable consideration is requested. If any impediment to the allowance of these claims remains after consideration of the above remarks, and such impediment could be removed during a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone Donald J. Coulman (Registration No. 50,406) at (541) 715-1694 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Briley

  
W. Bradley Haymond  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 35,186